

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

ORDER

Plaintiff,

99-cr-106-bbc

v.

ROBERT FLEMISTER,

Defendant.

In an order entered on December 27, 2011, I denied defendant Robert Flemister's motion under 18 U.S.C. § 3582. Defendant has filed a notice of appeal, without submitting the \$455 fee for filing his notice of appeal that is required if he is to take an appeal from the denial of a § 3582 motion. Therefore, I construe defendant's notice as including a request for leave to proceed in forma pauperis on appeal under 28 U.S.C. § 1915.

As an initial matter, I note that defendant's appeal appears to be untimely. It was not filed within fourteen days of the date of the order denying his motion, and defendant did not include with his notice a motion for an extension of time to file a notice of appeal that was supported by a showing of excusable neglect or good cause for the late filing as Fed. R. App. P. 4 requires. However, district courts do not have authority to deny a defendant's

request for leave to proceed in forma pauperis on the ground that the appeal is untimely. That authority rests solely with the court of appeals. Sperow v. Melvin, 153 F.3d 780 (7th Cir. 1998). Therefore, I will consider defendant's request for leave to proceed in forma pauperis on appeal and deny the motion because defendant's appeal is not taken in good faith. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3).

According to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a), a defendant who is found eligible for court-appointed counsel in the district court proceedings may proceed on appeal in forma pauperis without further authorization "unless the district court shall certify that the appeal is not taken in good faith or shall find that the party is otherwise not entitled so to proceed." Defendant had court-appointed counsel during the criminal proceedings against him. Therefore, he can proceed in forma pauperis on appeal unless I find that his appeal is taken in bad faith. In this case a reasonable person could not suppose that the appeal has some merit, as is required in order for the appeal to be taken in good faith. As I explained in the December 27, 2011 order, defendant is eligible for a sentence reduction under § 3582 but technically it makes no sense because defendant's sentence, as imposed, was lower than his sentence would be if it were reduced under § 3582.

Under Fed. R. App. P. 24, defendant has 30 days from the date of this order in which to ask the court of appeals to review this court's denial of leave to proceed in forma pauperis on appeal. His motion must be accompanied by (1) an affidavit as described in the first

paragraph of Fed. R. App. P. 24(a) and (2) a copy of this order.

ORDER

IT IS ORDERED that defendant Robert Flemister's request for leave to proceed in forma pauperis on appeal is DENIED. I certify that defendant's appeal is not taken in good faith. Defendant has the right to appeal this order certifying his appeal as not taken in good faith.

Entered this 29th day of February, 2012.

BY THE COURT:
/s/
BARBARA B. CRABB
District Judge